



500.35516CX1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Y. AKIBA et al
Serial No.: 09/956,909
Filed: September 21, 2001
For: LOW-EMI ELECTRONIC APPARATUS, LOW-EMI
CIRCUIT BOARD, AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURING
THE LOW-EMI CIRCUIT BOARD
Group: 2827
Examiner: T. DINH

CONF. No. 3793

ISSUE FEE NOT YET PAID

**RESPONSE TO THE DRAWING CORRECTION REQUIREMENT IN THE
NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY TRANSMITTAL (FORM PTO-37) RECEIVED
WITH THE OFFICIAL NOTIFICATION OF ALLOWABILITY, DATED
JULY 7, 2003**

MS: ISSUE FEE

Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

October 3, 2003

Sir:

Applicant's, through their undersigned representative, note with appreciation the formal allowance of the above-identified application. In reviewing the papers received, it is noted that there is an outstanding requirement to correct drawing figures based on an alleged proposal to amend the drawings filed on March 5, 2003 (See item 8(b) in the Notice of Allowability transmittal (form PTO-37) regarding the presently outstanding requirement). With regard to this matter, the file history of the above-identified application was

reviewed and it is observed that no such official drawing proposal on March 5, 2003 or, for that matter, at any other time, in the present application was submitted in the USPTO for official consideration by the Examiner. In support of this, enclosed herewith is a photocopy of the dated postcard receipt from the USPTO concerning the items officially filed in the USPTO on March 5, 2003. As one can clearly observe, from **Attachment A**, the only items submitted on March 5, 2003 include a response to an Office Action, a Petition for Extension of Time and Credit Card Payment Form covering the fee amount for the Extension of Time.

In reviewing the matter filed on March 5, 2003, further, there is attached at the end of the response, entitled "*Response to Non-Final Office Action*," dated March 5, 2003, a sheet including drawing sketches A and B. These sketches (as can be seen from the context of the supportive discussion/rebuttal arguments in that response) were submitted for purposes of discussion only in support of the arguments submitted in that response. That is, *the attached sketches A and B to the response submitted on March 5, 2003 are not proposals to amend the drawings but, rather, were included for discussion only in aiding a better understanding of the invention and how it differentiates over previously applied reference(s) in the rejection.* It is submitted, therefore, the outstanding drawing requirement was erroneously made. Accordingly, this requirement under item 8(b) in the Notice of Allowability transmittal (form PTO-37) is being traversed and withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of

this paper to the Deposit Account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Dep.
Acct. No. 01-2135 (500.35516CX1), and please credit any excess fees to such
deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Larry N. Aragnos
Reg. No. 32,392

LNA/dks
703-312-6600
Enclosures:

Attachment A - Copy of USPTO-dated postcard for March 5, 2003 filing

